APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/805,626	03/13/2001	Mingjing Li	MS1-725US	3014

22801   7590   10/14/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	4

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/805,626	LI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh B Thai	2171	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

This is in response to amendment dated August 2, 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 2, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Regarding claim 40, applicant argues that Marchisio (US 6,510,406) "does not describe a

search module coupled to access a media content source and collect a plurality of media content

pieces and associated text from the media content source" (response 8/2/03, page 18). In

response, the system of Marchisio discloses the search module (24, Fig.2, Marchisio) being

coupled to storage module (22, Fig. 2) for storing input web documents represented by the form

of term-document matrix (see col. 19, lines 1-4, Marchisio). Clearly, web documents could be

any media content source. Further, the search engine of Marchisio system discloses information

retrieval technology in form of information retrieval tool referred as "semantic interpreter" to

perform categorization of speech (see col. 18, lines 54-57, Marchisio) and digital speech (see col.

19, lines 10-13, Marchisio) which are media content. And the collection of media content pieces

must be done by the process of comparing the content of a current document set to some earlier

document set to determine or summarize conceptual in a conversation (see col. 18, lines 56-61,

Marchisio). Therefore, Marchisio discloses the claimed limitation.

In addition, applicant argues that the feature extraction modules 21 of Marchisio

receiving input documents are not the same as the one or more text features extracted from a

media content piece (page 19). Examiner respectively disagrees because Marchisio discloses the

claimed limitation. As discussed above, the web document contains the media content.
Therefore, the extraction from document includes the extraction from media content piece, and
the indexing module is being coupled to generate a query vector "text feature vector" (see col. 5,
lines 8-14, col. 6, lines 35-38, Marchisio) based on these extracted text features.

Regarding claims 1, 41 and 48-50, applicant argues that Marchisio does not teach "the
text feature vector associated with the plurality of media content pieces ... comparing the query
vector to text features associated with the plurality of media content pieces" (page 20). Examiner
respectively disagrees because Marchisio teach all of the claimed limitation. Marchisio teaches
the text feature vector associated with the plurality of media content pieces as discussed above.
Further, Marchisio teach comparing the query vector to the document (see col4, lines 54-47 and
col.6, lines 35-38, marchisio) that is text features associated with the plurality of media content
pieces.

In addition, applicant agues that neither Marchisio nor Hoffert (US 6,282,549) discloses
"receiving user feedback regarding the relevance of the identified media content pieces".
Examiner respectively disagrees because Marchisio teach this claimed limitation. For example
Marchisio teach the relevance feedback from the user (see col. 4, lines 56-57), the feedback on
the expansion for the query (see col. 15, lines 57-59)[1] and the similar document to a list of
documents that are relevant to a paragraph selection in the page (see col. 16, lines 52-56,
Marchisio) are the examples of user feedback.

Regarding claims 51-53, applicant argues that neither reference provides any teaching as
to how the offline user feedback. Examiner respectively disagrees because Marchisio and Ma

(US 6,347,313) combination discloses the claimed limitation. For example, Marchisio discloses

the user feedback as discussed above. Ma discloses an information embedding based on user

relevance feedback for object retrieval method (see title of Ma) and the method can perform

offline (see col. 9, lines 31-37, Ma) as an evidence for "offline user feedback".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e), as revised by the AIPA and H.R. 2215, applies to all qualifying

references, except when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an

international application filed before November 29, 2000. For such patents, the prior art date is

determined under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as it existed prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-

AIPA 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)).

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marchisio (U. S. Patent

no. 6,510,406).

Regarding claim 40, Marchisio discloses a system comprising:

---

[1] One of ordinary skill in the art would understand that "the expansion of the query" is not done automatically, but is

-     a crawler module (24, Fig 2) coupled to access a media content source and collect a plurality of media content pieces (see col. 18, line 48 to col. 19, line 13, Marchisio) and associated text from the media content source (see col. 8, lines 38-44, Marchisio); please note that "crawler module" corresponds to "search module" (24, Fig. 2, Marchisio).

-     a feature extraction module (21, Fig2) coupled to extract one or more text features from one of the media content pieces (see col. 8, lines 46-49, Marchisio); and

-     a media content indexing module (20, Fig.2) coupled to generate a text feature vector (see col. 5, lines 8-14, col. 6, lines 35-38, Marchisio), based on the extracted one or more text features, corresponding to the one media content piece (see col.8, lines 50-56, Marchisio).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-39 and 41-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchisio (U. S. Patent no. 6,510,406) in view of Hoffert et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,282,549).

done manually and is done by the user.

Regarding claims 1, 41 and 48-50, Marchisio discloses one or more computer-readable

media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more

processors of a computer, causes the one or more processors to perform the following acts:

- receiving search criteria (see col. 5, lines 8-11 and col. 7, lines 27-34, Marchisio);

- generating a query vector based on text features of the search criteria (see col. 5, lines

  11-17 and col.7, lines 35-39, Marchisio);

- identifying media content pieces (see col. 7, lines 30-34) to be rendered by comparing

  the query vector to text feature vectors associated with a plurality of media content

  pieces (see col. 7, lines 30-34; col. 8, lines 7-10; col. 18, lines 54-61; col.19, lines 10-

  13 and Fig. 12, Marchisio). Please note that the "digitized speech" corresponds to

  "media content";

- receiving user feedback regarding the relevancy of the identified media content pieces

  (see col. 15, lines 57-59 and Col. 19, lines 4-8, Marchisio);

- modifying the query vector based on the user feedback (see col.7, lines 55-65 and col. '

  16, lines 52-56, Marchisio);

- modifying one or more of the text feature vectors (see feature 27, Fig.3 and col. 14,

  lines 25-31, Marchisio).

- identifying new media content pieces (see col. 7, lines 30-34; 27, Fig. 3).

Marchisio, however, does not explicitly disclose "the text feature vectors associated with

the plurality of media content pieces". Hoffert, on the other hand, discloses these

limitations (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 12; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8 and lines

55-57, Hoffert). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Marchsio to include the text feature associated with media

content in the document object as evidenced by Hoffert. The motivation of doing so

would have been to provide for analysis of the content of files found in the search (see

col. 2, lines 24-27, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 2, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses generating another

query vector based on one or more low-level features of the search criteria (see col. 17, lines 8-

21, Marchisio); and wherein the identifying comprises, comparing the query vector to text

feature vectors associated with the plurality of media content pieces to generate first results,

comparing the other query vector to other low-level feature vectors associated with the plurality

of media content pieces to generate second results, and combining, for one of the plurality of

media content pieces, the first and second results corresponding to the one media content piece

(see col. 17, lines 47-53 and Fig. 10, Marchisio).

Regarding claims 3-5, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the altering,

based on the user feedback, a weighting of the results used in the combining (see col. 17, lines

44-66, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 6, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the search criteria

comprise one or more words (see 5, Fig.1, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 7, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses that the piece of

media content comprises an image (see 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 8, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media

content comprises a portion of audio content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 9, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media

content comprises a portion of multimedia content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and abstract of Hoffert).

Regarding claims 10 and 26, Marchisio discloses a method comprising:

- identifying a media content source (SEE Fig.3, Marchisio); the feature extraction

    module (21, Fig.3) extracts the media content from the content source as shown in

    Fig. 3 of Marchisio (see col.18, lines 54-61 and col. 19, lines 10-13).

- collecting one or more pieces of media content and associated text from the media

    content source (see 39, Fig.3; col.9, lines 4-6 and col. 10, lines 8-10);

- extracting, for a piece of media content, one or more text features from the associated

    text (see 21, Fig3, Marchisio); and

- making the one or more text features available for searching (see col. 10, lines 32-39

    and Fig.3, Marchisio).

Marchisio, however, does not explicitly disclose "the text feature vectors associated with

the plurality of media content pieces". Hoffert, on the other hand, discloses these

limitations (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 12; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8 and lines

55-57, Hoffert). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Marchsio to include the text feature associated with media

content in the document object as evidenced by Hoffert. The motivation of doing so

would have been to allow user to search media content which Marchisio would not

otherwise be able to (see col. 2, lines 24-27, Hoffert).

Regarding claims 11-12, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose generating one

or more text feature vectors from the extracted one or more text features (see col. 7, lines 35-39

and 21, Fig. 3); and wherein the making comprises making the one or more text feature vectors

available for searching (see Fig.3, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 13, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose a method of

collected piece of media content: classifying the image as meaningful or not meaningful; and

wherein the extracting comprises extracting the one or more text features for the piece of media

content only if the piece of media content is classified as meaningful (see col. 8, lines 11-19,

Hoffert).

Regarding claim 14, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose a plurality of web

pages, each web page including a plurality of pieces of media content and text associated with

one or more of the plurality of pieces of media content (col. 4, line 8 and lines 55-57, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 15, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose a filename and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the filename (see col. 6, line 22, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 16, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose a uniform resource locator (URL) and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the URL (see col. 6, lines 45-67, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 17, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose that the associated text for a piece of media content comprises alternate text that can be displayed in place of the media content, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words of the alternate text (see col. 5, lines 30-34, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 18, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the associated text for a piece of media content comprises text surrounding the piece of media content on a web page, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words of the text surrounding the piece of media content (see col. 5, lines 62 to col. 6, lines 9, Hoffert) .

Regarding claim 19, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the associated text for a piece of media content comprises a title of a web page that includes the piece of media content, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the title (see col. 6, lines 19-22, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 20, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the associated text for a piece of media content comprises a link on a web page that includes the piece of media content, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the link (see col. 6, lines 15-21, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 21, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the associated text for a piece of media content comprises anchor text corresponding to the piece of media content, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the anchor text (see col. 7, lines 46-61, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 22, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the associated text for a piece of media content comprises an image annotation corresponding to the piece of media content, and the one or more text features comprises one or more words in the image annotation (see col. 7, lines 45-51, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 23, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses that the piece of media content comprises an image (see 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 24, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media content comprises a portion of audio content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 25, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media

content comprises a portion of multimedia content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and abstract of Hoffert).

Regarding claims 27-28 and 39, Marchisio discloses a method comprising:

- receiving search criteria (see col. 5, lines 8-11 and col. 7, lines 27-34, Marchisio);

- generating a query vector based on the search criteria (see col. 5, lines 11-17 and

    col.7, lines 35-39, Marchisio);

- comparing the query vector to a feature vector corresponding to a piece of media

    content and having been generated based on text associated with the piece to of media

    content (see col. 7, lines 30-34; col. 8, lines 7-10; col. 18, lines 54-61; col.19, lines

    10-13 and Fig. 12, Marchisio). Please note that the "digitized speech" corresponds to

    "media content"; and

- determining, based at least in part on a result of the comparing, whether to render the

    piece of media content to a user (see col. 8, lines 33-36, Marchisio).

Marchisio, however, does not explicitly disclose "the text feature vectors associated with

the plurality of media content pieces". Hoffert, on the other hand, discloses these

limitations (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 12; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8 and lines

55-57, Hoffert). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Marchsio to include the text feature associated with media

content in the document object as evidenced by Hoffert. The motivation of doing so

would have been to allow user to search media content which Marchisio would not

otherwise be able to (see col. 2, lines 24-27, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 29, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses generating another

query vector based on one or more low-level features of the search criteria (see col. 17, lines 8-

21, Marchisio); and wherein the identifying comprises, comparing the query vector to text

feature vectors associated with the plurality of media content pieces to generate first results,

comparing the other query vector to other low-level feature vectors associated with the plurality

of media content pieces to generate second results, and combining, for one of the plurality of

media content pieces, the first and second results corresponding to the one media content piece

(see col. 17, lines 47-53 and Fig. 10, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 30, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the altering, based

on the user feedback, a weighting of the results used in the combining (see col. 17, lines 44-66,

Marchisio).

Regarding claim 31, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose distance between the

other query vector see col. 5, lines 10-20, Hoffert).

Regarding claims 32 and 34, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the

altering, based on the user feedback, a weighting of the results used in the combining (see col.

17, lines 44-66, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 33, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further disclose the user space vector corresponding to a particular piece of media content to modify the feature vector corresponding to the particular piece of media content (see Fig.3A, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 35, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the search criteria comprise one or more words (see 5, Fig.1, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 36, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses that the piece of media content comprises an image (see 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 37, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media content comprises a portion of audio content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and 101, Fig.1, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 38, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the piece of media content comprises a portion of multimedia content (see col. 8, lines 1-53 and abstract of Hoffert).

Regarding claims 42 and 47, Marchisio discloses a method comprising:

- receiving search criteria (see col. 5, lines 8-11 and col. 7, lines 27-34, Marchisio);

- identifying, based at least in part on the search criteria, a piece of media content to be rendered (see col. 7, lines 30-34);

-        receiving user feedback regarding the relevancy of the rendered piece of media

content (see col. 16, lines 57-59 and Col. 19, lines 4-8, Marchisio);

-        weighting for another piece of media content (see col. 17, lines 47-53,

Marchisio), based on the user feedback, both a result of comparing the high-

level query vector to a high-level feature vector of the other piece of media

content and a result of comparing the low-level is query vector to a low-level

feature vector of the other piece of media content (see col. 17, lines 14-21,

Marchisio). The multiple levels' vector search in Marchisio correspond to the

low and high feature vector; and

-        combining the weighted result to determine whether to identify the other 20

piece of media content for rendering (see col. 17, lines 54-66, Marchisio).

Marchisio, however, does not explicitly disclose "the text feature vectors associated with

the plurality of media content pieces". Hoffert, on the other hand, discloses these

limitations (see col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 12; col. 3, line 65 to col. 4, line 8 and lines

55-57, Hoffert). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

of the invention to modify Marchsio to include the text feature associated with media

content in the document object as evidenced by Hoffert. The motivation of doing so

would have been to allow user to search media content which Marchisio would not

otherwise be able to (see col. 2, lines 24-27, Hoffert).

Regarding claim 43, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the multiple levels'

vector search (see col. 17, lines 14-21 and 47-53, Marchisio) correspond to the low and high

feature vector. Therefore, it is obvious to generate a new high-level query vector and new low-level query vector based on the search criteria.

Regarding claim 44, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses generating a user space vector corresponding to the piece of media content and using the user space vector corresponding to the piece of media content to modify the high-level feature vector (see col. 2, lines 3-43, Marchisio).

Regarding claim 45, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses altering a weighting of one or more elements in the feature vector based on the user feedback (see col. 4, lines 56-57), ;(see col. 15, lines 57-59) and the similar document to a list of documents that are relevant to a paragraph selection in the page (see col. 16, lines 52-56, Marchisio)

Regarding claim 46, Marchisio/Hoffert combination further discloses the feature vector of the other piece of media content is a text feature vector (see col. 5, lines 8-14, col. 6, lines 35-38, marchisio).

Claims 51-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchisio (U. S. Patent no. 6,510,406) in view of Ma et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,347,313).

Regarding claim 51, Marchisio discloses one or more computer-readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors of a computer, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

- identifying a piece of media content to render to a user based at least in part on comparing a query vector corresponding to search criteria of the user and a feature vector corresponding to the piece of media content (see col. 7, lines 30-34; col. 8, lines 7-10; col. 18, lines 54-61; col.19, lines 10-13 and Fig. 12, Marchisio). Please note that the "digitized speech" corresponds to "media content";

- receiving user feedback regarding the relevancy of the piece of media content (see col. 16, lines 57-59 and Col. 19, lines 4-8, Marchisio);

- modifying the query vector based on the received user feedback (see col.7, lines 55-65, Marchisio).

Marchisio, however, does not disclose "the received user feedback in an off line". Ma, on the other hand, discloses the user feedback processing that is performed off-line (see col.9, lines 21-41, Ma). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the user feedback in an off-line as taught by Ma. The motivation of doing so would have been to enable effective database searching based on the level semantic features (see col. 2, lines 18-20, Ma).

Regarding claims 52 and 53, Marchisio/Ma combination discloses all of the claimed subject matter. However, Marchisio's relevancy values reads on the claimed "confidence" value. Because the new query vector D is adjusted based on the relevancy value (in the same manner as is the claimed vector D adjusted on the confidence value), the Examiner takes the position that the claimed relationship (see formula claim 52) is in fact inherent in Marchisio. And for the

formula in the claim 53 is basically a calculating the different between the value 1 and adjusted

vector.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marchisio (U. S.

Patent no. 6,510,406) in view of Ma et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,347,313) and further view of

Hoffert et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,282,549).

Regarding claim 54, Marchisio/Ma combination discloses all of the claimed subject

matter as discussed above, except Marchisio/Ma combination does not explicitly disclose audio

content, visual content, and multimedia content. But it is well known to use the audio content,

visual content, and multimedia content in computer-readable media system as evidence by

Hoffert (see Fig. 1 and Abstract of Hoffert). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the audio content, visual content,

and multimedia content as taught by Hoffert. The motivation of doing so would have been to

enhance the search content.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai HT
Art Unit 2171
October 1, 2003

UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
AU 2171